

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-7383**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JAMES GOOSLIN, a/k/a Jimmy,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern  
District of West Virginia, at Charleston. John T.  
Copenhaver, Jr., District Judge. (2:05-cr-00180; 2:08-cv-00001)

---

Submitted: March 22, 2010

Decided: May 6, 2010

---

Before MICHAEL,\* DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James Gooslin, Appellant Pro Se. Erik S. Goes, Assistant United  
States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

---

\* Judge Michael was a member of the original panel but did  
not participate in this decision. This opinion is filed by a  
quorum of the panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

PER CURIAM:

James Gooslin seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2009) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by the district court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Gooslin has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Gooslin's motion for a copy of the Government's motion in limine, deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED